



PLANNING COMMITTEE SOUTH - UPDATE SHEET

26 July 2022

Item 6: DC/21/4002/ARM - Approval of reserved matters - the construction of 173 dwellings (including 80 affordable houses) together with associated works, landscaping and infrastructure for Brightwell Lakes (Phase W1) - on DC/20/1234/VOC - Land to the south and east of Adastral Park

Consultation responses

The latest re-consultation ended on 18 July 2022 - this followed receipt of a number of design revisions, as listed within the report. Since the publication of the committee report a number of further consultee responses were received – these are shown below in bold.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Kirton Parish Council	8 September 2021 13 September 2021 20 May 2022 4 July 2022	4 October 2021 No response 11 June 2022 14 July 2022
<p>Summary of comments:</p> <p><u>4 October 2021</u> “Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council considered this application at its meeting in 20th September 2021 and objects to the proposals, having severe reservation about generated traffic that will put utmost strain on an already over capacity road network which relies on the main arterial roads (A12/A14) to allow cars and HGV’s to travel to and from work etc. This is a peninsular, so alternative routes are unavailable as Ipswich is very quickly gridlocked. Noise, light and construction dust pollution will have a massive effect on wildlife and existing homeowners in what is a tranquil area. All surface water will inevitably flow into the Mill River and surrounding watercourses leading to potential flooding downstream.”</p> <p><u>11 June 2022</u> “Kirton & Falkenham PC have no comments to make on this application.”</p>		

LEGAL ADDRESS East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT
DX: 41400 Woodbridge

POSTAL ADDRESS Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft NR33 0EQ
DX: 41220 Lowestoft

14 July 2022

"Kirtton & Falkenham arish Council has considered this application and has no comments to make."

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
East Suffolk Housing Development Team	8 September 2021	No response
	13 September 2021	No response
	20 May 2022	No response
	4 July 2022	14 July 2022

Summary of comments:

No response.

14 July 2022

"Advice on this scheme was provided in February but does not appear to have been considered. As it stands, the mix, property types and layout are wholly unacceptable in its current format for the following reasons.

- 1. 60 units or 75% of all the affordable housing is delivered as flats, whilst all the market housing are houses. This is against the tenure neutral guidance presented in the local plan and Affordable housing SPD**
- 2. There are no three or four bed homes available as affordable homes. This does not meet the needs of the local community as per guidance in the local plan, SHMAA and previous advice from the Housing Enabling Team.**
- 3. None of the affordable homes meet the M4(2) standard. This is against the Affordable housing SPD guidance which is based on evidenced need of this form of housing.**
- 4. The location of all the affordable housing is located near the road and is not well integrated within the rest of the scheme. This is against the policies within the Local Plan and Affordable Housing SPD.**

The application is for a net total of 173. For this site, a total of 80 affordable homes. The Councils preferred mix was provided below on 24th February, 2022. It clearly shows a need for three and four bed homes across all affordable housing tenures.

At least 50% of all dwellings should meet the building regulations M4(2) wheelchair accessible standards, both for market and affordable homes. The matrix above reflects the higher need for M4(2) dwellings in the affordable sector, especially the affordable rented sector. The wheelchair adaptable standard M4(3) would be supported and applicants are welcome to discuss how these properties could be delivered as part of the scheme.

All homes must be in small clusters of no more than 10 homes and not contiguous, well-integrated and indistinguishable within the scheme with equal access to amenities such as children's play parks and amenity green space.

Dwellings should meet the following size standards; 1 bed, 2 persons; 2 bed, 4 persons; 3 bed, 5 persons; and 4 bed, 6 persons, with a predominance of houses, especially for families."

See full response on Public Access.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Historic England	8 September 2021 13 September 2021 20 May 2022 4 July 2022	19 October 2021 No response 6 June 2022 15 July 2022

Summary of comments:

19 October 2021

“Recommendation: We consider that the application does not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 189, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 202 and 203. There are also issues and safeguards outlined in our advice above, that we consider need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of these paragraphs. Further safeguards are also required to ensure the applicant has addressed the heritage conditions on the outline application. Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If, however, you propose to determine the application in its current form, please treat this as a letter of objection, inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity.”

See full response on Public Access.

6 June 2022

“Recommendation: Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. As it stands, we consider the application therefore fails several the key heritage policies of the NPPF. It does not demonstrate the requirements of 189, 194 and 195, particularly 194 in terms of supporting information. No enhancements are provided or demonstrated as required under 197. In addition, we recommend your authority would need to take into consideration paragraphs 199, 200, 202 and 203 in coming to a decision. We consider that the application does not meet these key policy requirements of the NPPF. We maintain our position that further safeguards are also required to ensure the applicant has addressed the heritage conditions on the outline application. Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If, however, you propose to determine the application in its current form, please treat this as a letter of objection, inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity.”

See full response on Public Access.

15 July 2022

“Historic England Advice In our letter of the 15th October 2021 and 6th June 2022 we raised concerns with regards to this reserved matter application because of the potential impact of the proposal upon a range of designated heritage assets.

We requested further reassurance from the applicant that the significance of these assets would be protected, and confirmation that your authority was satisfied there were sufficient safeguards in place to ensure protection of heritage assets through all various phases of the development. We are aware these matters are still outstanding and although additional information has been submitted it does not include updated or amended heritage documents.

We set out detailed comments and the policy position in our previous letter and would welcome further discussion with the Planning Authority as to the position with regards to heritage matters and the when this information is likely to be forthcoming.

Recommendation

As it currently stands Historic England still has concerns about the application on heritage grounds. We consider the application therefore fails several the key heritage policies of the NPPF. It does not demonstrate the requirements of 189, 194 and 195, particularly 194 in terms of supporting information. No enhancements are provided or demonstrated as required under 197. In addition, we recommend your authority would need to take into consideration paragraphs 199, 200, 202 and 203 in coming to a decision.

We consider that the application does not meet these key policy requirements of the NPPF.

We maintain our position that further information is also required to ensure the applicant has addressed the heritage conditions on the outline application.

Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If, however, you propose to determine the application in its current form, please treat this as a letter of objection, inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity."

See full response on Public Access.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Waldringfield Parish Council	8 September 2021	22 October 2021
	13 September 2021	No response
	20 May 2022	16 June 2022
	4 July 2022	18 July 2022

Summary of comments:

22 October 2021

"We would like to thank the officers from ESC and the representatives of the applicants for organising and attending the two virtual meetings held on October 15th. Both meetings were extremely helpful. Most of the issues we wish to raise apply to each/all of the applications listed above and this response is sent in respect of each of the 4 ARMs. Our comments are based primarily on assessing the information included in these applications against conditions in the Outline Planning Permission DC/17/1435/OUT. We have arranged our comments by topic. 1. Access The applications include statements that are ambiguous and in some cases contradictory, here are some examples: "The main access to the Site is from Ipswich Road located on the southeast. A further vehicular access is proposed from the Boulevard Spine Road which links to the main access via the proposed primary road." (DCS Phase E1, §3.13). (Our emphasis). It is not clear from the above paragraph whether the reference to the "Site" relates to the entire Brightwell Lakes site or just the area of phase E1. Also it doesn't specify if the access to Ipswich Rd is the East Ipswich Rd access or the West Ipswich Rd access. "The main vehicular route into Phase E1 is located on the south-east providing access to Ipswich Road and the wider highway network. A secondary access is to be created from the Spine Road ..." (Phase E1 Planning Statement, §3.3)

(Our emphasis). In more recent discussions with the applicants we have been informed that “Once occupied, residents will only be able to access the site via the new A12 junction and the Eastern Ipswich Road access points.” (Our emphasis.) Is this the entire Brightwell Lakes site or just the area of phase E1? “Alongside new point of access which in the short term will provide a temporary exit route for construction traffic but over the lifetime of the development be converted into an emergency access point only.” (Phase E1 Planning Statement, §5.59) (Our emphasis). Subsequent discussions with the applicants indicated that the above paragraph is referring to West Ipswich Rd access but this is not clear from the statements in the ARMs. Is this to be seen as VOC of Condition 43, or is it an error? We would ask that the ARMs are amended to ensure that there is complete continuity and consistency across all the statements on the matter of the access routes within the ARMs in order to comply with outline planning consent conditions and avoid misunderstandings/confusion. The outline planning permission is clear that the primary access point is to be a new traffic signal controlled 3 way junction on the A12 between the existing Foxhall Road and BT roundabouts. Two secondary access points are proposed onto the Ipswich Rd.

2. Charging Points for Electric Vehicles The move towards electric vehicles (EVs) has accelerated considerably since the outline planning consent in 2018. The UK Government intends to pass legislation (which will come into law in 2022) which will mandate EV charging points on all new buildings: “We will publish our consultation response on requiring all new residential and non-residential buildings to have a charge point, and we intend to lay legislation later this year,” (Department for Transport Minister Rachel Maclean. <https://earth.org/uk-to-be-first-country-to-require-new-homes-to-have-built-in-ev-chargers/>) We are not planning lawyers but this would seem to override the now outdated planning condition 64. “Prior to the submission of the 1000th dwelling for layout reserved matters approval, an electric vehicle charging strategy shall be submitted” (Planning Condition 64). Even without the anticipated new legislation this planning condition has been overtaken by the rapid development of technology and sales and is now in conflict with: “ESC Policy SCLP7.2. c) Proposals involving vehicle parking will be supported where they take opportunities to make efficient use of land and they include: c. Appropriate provision for vehicle charging points and ancillary infrastructure associated with the increased use of low emission vehicles;” This is referred to in the both the E1 and W1 Planning Statements, §4.18. However, there is no mention in any of the four ARMs of charging points for electric vehicles, either attached to the houses or in the parking courtyards, or on the street. Given that all new cars sold from 2030 onwards are to be EVs, it is essential that all homes and all parking courtyards have EV charging points. If the charging strategy (let alone the actual charging points) is delayed until plans for 1,000 houses have been submitted, that will be far too late. What would happen to the plots that have already been built? Either they would be left without public charging points, or charging points would have to be retro-fitted, which would be disruptive and expensive. We appreciate there are complications with management companies and a rapidly changing technology, and that charging points are covered by building regulations rather than planning, but feel that a general statement of strategy from both ESC and the applicants would be helpful.

3. Street Lighting There is no mention of street lighting and the need to avoid light pollution. There are some welcome statements in the Environmental Action Plan, Appendix 6: CEMP Ecology Method Statements, Protection from lighting disturbance, but this is solely about the construction phase (CEMP = Construction Environmental Management Plan). Following subsequent discussions with the applicants we understand that the details of the external lighting will now be submitted as an addition to the ARMs to comply with condition 61: “As part of each layout reserved matters application, details of external lighting to be installed ... shall be submitted to and approved” (Planning Condition 61) We would ask that consultees are given the opportunity to comment on these later submissions.

4. Construction Phases Apart from the ecological constraints described in the CEMP, there doesn’t seem to be anything about how the construction phases will work. How will the building materials, lorries, diggers, etc. access the

site? What volume of construction traffic is predicted along the Ipswich Rd for the two main phases (E1 and W1)? Is the A12 access to be used for construction traffic? We appreciate that prior to any development taking place a Construction Method/Management Statement will be submitted for approval (Planning Condition 18), however it would be useful to have answers to these questions this stage, as they will have a profound impact on the traffic on the Ipswich Road and therefore on the residents of Waldringfield. We would like assurance that the public footpaths running along the south sides of both sites, E1 and W1 will remain open during construction.

5. Car Parking Since the tertiary roads within the phases are so narrow, it is essential that sufficient off-street and on-street parking laybys are provided, to prevent parking in the roadside, potentially blocking the road. We would ask for the parking provision to be broken down and shown by ARM areas rather than for the whole site. The off-street parking courts in the private parking areas appear to be isolated from the dwellings they are serving, and in many cases these areas are bordered by garden fences/hedges etc and so are not overlooked by the residents of the dwellings. We are concerned that, because of this layout, getting from the parking bay to the front door could be intimidating and possibly dangerous at night, particularly for women. We would wish to see the detailed lighting plan for these areas included in the plans to be submitted under item 3 above.

6. Energy Efficiency There appears to be no mention of the energy efficiency of the houses. Given that the Government is legally obliged to reduce the UK's greenhouse gas emissions by 68% by 2030, and that housing contributes 18% of the UK's emissions, it is essential that all new homes are built to the highest possible standards of energy efficiency. Will the houses have loft insulation? Cavity wall insulation? Double or even triple glazing? Solar PV panels? Heat pumps?

7. Phasing and Timing Although a phasing map is provided, there are no accompanying dates or even approximate timings. Some timings have been provided elsewhere, for example in the slides which were presented to the Brightwell Lakes Community Forum in June 2021, but without this information in the ARMs it is difficult to get a clear picture of how these four phases fit in to the bigger picture. We ask to be provided, as part of the ARMs, a timing sequence of the start and completion dates of:

- Ipswich Rd access West
- Ipswich Rd access East
- A12 junction
- 'Spine' road (boulevard)
- Phases W1, W1a, E1 & E1a
- SANG (various areas)

8. Previously submitted but undetermined ARMs We understand from subsequent discussions with the applicant and ESC that the applicants are currently reviewing/amending the two extant ARMs DC/18/2774/ARM (infrastructure) and DC/18/2775/ARM (SANG), and that these revisions will shortly be submitted to ESC. We ask to be notified and invited to comment on the changes.

9. Phase E1a The Phase E1 Landscape Masterplan (JBA18/163-SK02) clearly shows the E1a area covering 9 houses, whereas all the other plans show E1a covering a much smaller area of just 3 houses. We have learnt in subsequent discussions that E1a will now consist of just 3 show houses.

10. Landscaping & Arboriculture WPC's Tree Warden has submitted comments on the landscaping and arboriculture aspects separately, and WPC fully endorses these."

22 October 2021

"Waldringfield tree warden's comments on the submission for Brightwell Lakes Phases E1, W1, E1a and W1b

1 Overall concept The phases here detailed are residential developments, the first four areas of the several required to complete the site. The layout of these is necessarily quite tight incorporating houses and flats, garages and parking spaces, cycle storage, footpaths and roads. There are few opportunities left for landscape planting of trees, hedges, shrubs and herbaceous material, and grasses. However where these exist they have not been used to their full advantage.

2 Wildlife corridors Although mention has been made of wildlife corridors in past documents these now seem to consist almost entirely of the peripheral bridleways which are already in existence for the main part and the necessary open spaces or SANGs including the main one around the lake not yet fully designed. There is no attempt to take the wildlife corridor into the housing development where it might link up with gardens. In these layouts gardens do not

back onto open areas but very largely onto other gardens meaning they are surrounded by tall (1.8m) grey closeboard fencing. The back gardens are turfed. There are no trees or climbers in the gardens whatsoever native or otherwise (see condition 12).

3 Proposed Trees Proposed trees are spaced 15m apart along both sides of main access roads. Trees within the development are a mere sprinkle. There are no groups of trees of different sizes and species. There are many dwellings within the development where there will not be a single tree visible from a window until residents (hopefully) start to plant them.

4 Tree canopy on maturity On the planting plan all proposed trees of whatever species or initial planting size are shown as circles of diameter 5m. It is not known at what stage of their development they are meant to be illustrated. However many are very narrowly fastigate trees. These are suited to restricted spaces such as city courtyards. There is a lot of the upright growing field maple *Acer campestre* Streetwise. This is predicted to reach a diameter of 3m after 25 years (using data from Hillier Nurseries). *Carpinus betulus* Franz Fontaine will reach 2.5 crown diameter, ornamental cherry *Prunus Amanogawa* only 1m wide after 25 years. Fastigate birch may make 1.5m wide spread and *Pyrus Chanticleer* (ornamental pear) 3m. Therefore all of these will be much narrower columns than shown on plan. Only *Acer Elsrijk* may reach 6m after 25 years and *Liquidambar* is predicted to reach 5m diameter. The others would be much smaller than the circles shown on the plans, half as big or less in some cases. These severely upright trees cast less shade, and are mostly without the contrast of more spreading forms as shown on the optimistic illustrative sections. They will not provide much leafy mass to complement the buildings. The exception Silver Birch is a native tree but shortlived. It has a limited lifespan of 60-80 years. There are very few shown although these are very good for wildlife supporting many insect species.

5 Species of trees selected The cultivar of Field Maple Streetwise is a clone. Therefore although providing food for wildlife in the seeds and leaves they are identical genetically which would mean a disaster if a disease struck. All the cultivars are genetically identical so similarly the cultivars of Hornbeam would be identical with each other. Among the tree species represented there are no oak, which is the main forest tree in this area in the woods bordering the larger overall site to the north and west. There is no hazel, no willow, no holly and in fact there are no native shrubs whatsoever. It seems that the wildlife travelling through will not find much sustenance. There are no pines to tie in visually with the existing tree belt of Austrian Pine, with one exception.

6 Survival of trees This area has had severe droughts in the past few summers and these very tall rootballed specimen trees are going to need plenty of watering. Generally, smaller trees survive better. No watering system is specified. Either an underground fitted irrigation system or a water bag to deliver water over a period may be necessary to combat drought and see the survival of these trees. Examples exist nearby of tall specimen trees planted and subsequently dying in numbers (e.g. Silver Birch at BT Adastral Park) *Liquidambar* is a fine tree from North America. It prefers a well drained but moist soil.

7 Shrubs: maintenance All ornamental, these are planted in 1m wide bands around the housing. They are maintained by the contractor in the first year. After this there is no management plan that we know of so far. Do the residents clip them? There are topiary yews and bay in pairs at several of the entrances. Are these maintained by the resident or visiting contractors? This seems rather a quirky idea. If contractor, they may end up like the planting at nearby Martlesham Heath Retail Park which is all cut by hedge trimmer to the same height, often removing flowers and berries. Most of these shrubs will outgrow their position if not carefully maintained.

8 Use of poisonous shrubs There are quite a lot of varieties of spindle (*Euonymus*) in the planting which is close to footpaths and house frontages. The native spindle is highly poisonous in all parts. These foreign relatives of it are also marked as injurious, may cause skin irritation. It is used very widely throughout the site in many cases close to where pedestrians will walk and ultimately the residents may decide to cut these themselves and would have to handle the foliage.

9 Non-native shrubs The Taylor Wimpey Environmental Strategy states that 'all new sites (will) have planting that provides for local species throughout the seasons'. None of the many thousands of shrubs or

hedges is a native species. While many have flowers and berries which may support our wildlife – Choisya and Hebe for example are good for bees when in flower – generally they are planted for their decorative foliage and do not provide ‘food and shelter’ for wildlife throughout the site. While not expecting a design with entirely British wild plants it is as though these have been excluded entirely. 10 Basin (in E1) This damp area receiving drainage from the swales is to be sown with a wetland wildflower and grass mix. It could be enhanced by adding a few groups of shrubby willows, dogwood and/or alder. This would increase its wildlife potential greatly. 11 Swales These are part of the Suds system and could provide useful habitat if they are maintained with the longer grass and flowers cut on a less frequent programme as described. The swales, about 8m long, are meant to be surrounded by shorter grass it would appear. I have not found a section drawing showing the depth and slopes of the swales. 12 Private gardens These are to be turfed and surrounded by fencing with no further planting. 13 Suggestions for greening the site A number of fairly easy things could be done to improve the appearance and wildlife potential of the new residential areas: 13.1 Residents with gardens could be offered a choice of small trees to plant in their gardens, such as Rowan, Crab Apple, Cherry Plum or varieties of domestic apple which would attract birds and bees into their gardens at the very least and soften the overall effect of the stark closeboard fencing. 13.2 Residents could also be offered a climber to go on their fence with a trellis attached for them (less work than clipping topiary) such as a climbing rose, clematis or honeysuckle, or an ornamental ivy, which they could select from. These would all provide nesting sites and soften the appearance of so many fences. 13.3 Street trees which are 15m apart could be at least doubled in number and do not have to be entirely fastigate. The narrow forms suit tight spaces, they are not necessary where the trees have plenty of space all around them. Whitebeam, Rowan, Crab apple, Wild Pear and larger growing trees such as Wild Cherry, Small Leafed Lime, Oak and Scots Pine could be placed where space permits. 13.4 Native hedges could be incorporated in some areas including fruiting plants for wildlife such as hawthorn, elderberry, dogrose, cherry plum, dogwood, holly, which all grow in the area. 14 In conclusion The plans are disappointing on a number of fronts. Wildlife and nature seem to have been far from the minds of whoever drew up the plans. The canopy effect will be very sparse even if all the trees grow to maturity. There is no relationship between the coastal location in Suffolk, with low rainfall and extremely sharp drainage, and the proposed vegetation on site. These proposals could just as easily be in any county in England. There are very few native species included.”

16 June 2022

“Waldringfield Parish Council met to discuss these applications and decided that it wished to make no additional comments to those previously submitted.”

18 July 2022

“WPC wishes to express our concern regarding the Variation of Condition application, DC/20/1234/VOC, referenced in these Reserved Matters applications. These applications are intrinsically linked with each other. This VOC has yet to be determined but the Parish Council has not been notified of the significant number of new documents submitted under DC/20/1234/VOC in the period 2018 to present. We will be writing separately on this matter.

With regards to the most recent documents submitted on DC/21/4002/ARM & DC/21/4003/ARM WPC is pleased to see the following amendments:

- **Water level of the drainage “lake” in the SANG valley is to be reduced to a low enough level to remove the protective fencing and make it more of an attractive amenity.**
- **Parking provision improved to meet SCC standards**

- Stretch of footpath increased to 3mts wide to allow pedestrian and cycle access to other areas of the site.
- Additional native species shrubs added. We are concerned that there appears to be some inconsistencies between the following drawings submitted.
- The Cycle Hierarchy Plan, 10596 – 2001 – 120
- The connectivity plan, drawing 22274/C11/CP
- The PROW Plan drawing 22274-PROW-01
- Drawing 10391-HL-110 as contained in condition 10 of the outline planning consent

For example the connectivity plan, drawing 22274/C11/CP shows some bridleways and describes them as pedestrian & cycle routes.

This drawing omits the “proposed permissive route” shown as Y - Z on the drawing 10391-HL-110. We would have imagined that this was an important link to the pedestrian & cycle routes and therefore should be included in 22274/C11/CP.”

Heritage impact

The Planning Manager has reviewed the comments received by Historic England and has subsequently advised Historic England that the local planning authority has had to disagree with their position. The outline application secured a well-designed approach to the known heritage assets and will require comprehensive design of all development surrounding the Heritage Park, when brought forward. Whole blocks of housing will sit between this parcel (W1/W1a) and the heritage assets. Therefore, once the heritage parcel is delivered (expected to be the next phase) there will be no physical or visual relationship between the current application and the heritage assets.

Design and conservation comments

Key comments for the applicant to specifically address within this parcel, which were initially raised by the Design and Conservation Officer are summarised below with latest revision comment shown in blue.

- **Street enclosure:** The layout of Plots 164-171, which form a single block, is somewhat problematic, with back-to-back gardens enclosing inset eight quadruple parking spaces forming two edges of the block. This is a very unattractive form of street enclosure and is a function of the block being too small – layout to be reconsidered.

This block has been redesigned to address these comments – dwellings now front the southern boundary (plot 164) and the northern aspect (plot 168), allowing the car parking arrangements to be redistributed and resulting in limited back-to-back gardens (see revised Planning Layout).

- **Connectivity and legibility:** The transverse road layout within the site does not fully connect. This is not problematic in a practical sense – the four secondary accesses onto the spine road ensure full access. This is not necessarily a good urban design outcome; however, the Design Compliance Statement appears to suggest that this is a deliberate design decision to prioritise transverse movement to pedestrians (presumably over vehicles).

Access between Plots 11-16 and 27-32, as well as between Plots 76-81 and 97-102, is now a shared surface. This road layout has been designed to prioritise pedestrian/cycle connectivity and is a design approach supported by the highway authority

- **Southern edge:** A better edge treatment along the southern edge suggested, where lateral secondary and tertiary roads have vistas that are closed by the southern boundary of the development. The detailed landscape drawings do not provide any particular strategy, such as tree clusters to provide view framing or green vista-closing (e.g., the lateral vista to the allotments which will want to be retained for orienteering through the layout). The ends of all of these roads seem to peter out into nothing-in-particular where they meet the southern edge. This non-approach would benefit from reconsideration, particularly because the spine-road edge shows a very well-considered approach to vista closing building placement in respect of future secondary accesses to the north (see Plots 104-109 for example).

The landscaping has been reviewed in the light of the layout to ensure the view through the site is of the proposed landscaping which previously had been designed in isolation.

- **Dwelling design:** No support for the flat-over garage house type in terms of design quality and residential amenity.

This is a standard house type for Taylor Wimpey and has not been addressed in any of the design revisions.

- **Boundary treatments:** The boundary treatment strategy requires revision - there should be no close-boarded timber fencing used on either of the key frontages to the A12 and spine road boulevard. High brick walls only will be acceptable here, to ensure quality and continuity of frontage.

All boundary treatments have been reviewed - any rear garden boundaries facing onto the public highway are now facing brick walls (see Boundary Treatment).

- **Materials:** There is no detailed materials schedule supplied that allows scrutinisation of materials specification – further details required.

No further details provided – these will be required to be submitted and agreed by the Design and Conservation Officer prior to issuing/or as a condition of the decision.

The above changes to the proposal have been reviewed by the Planning Manager and he has discussed these with the Principal Design and Conservation Officer. Unfortunately, due to some short term but demanding resource matters within the Design and Conservation Team, a full concluding write up of the revisions has not been possible. However, the Principal Design and Conservation Officer has reviewed the amended submission and is satisfied with the changes made in response to his original points of criticism within a wider supportive response. Therefore, the application as amended has his support.

Affordable housing

The Planning Manager has reviewed the application alongside comments received by the Housing Strategy and Enabling Manager and is satisfied with the position the local planning authority has reached. Although it does not have a comprehensive mix, as an early and higher density parcel of

the site, which plays an important role in the delivery of the Boulevard, the flat led approach to affordable delivery from this parcel was anticipated and is what the Planning Manager believes will work best for the place shaping role for the taller and higher density-built frontage of the Boulevard needs. The Planning Manager is pleased that the open market and affordable does interchange along the boulevard and also that there is no affordable pushed onto the A12 frontage, which the past developer interest had aimed at.

Subsequently, Taylor Wimpey has confirmed that they will work closely with the Housing Strategy and Enabling Manager to develop a clear strategy on how the mix is distributed across further parcels. The Planning Manager is certain that the large parcels immediately north will have a better mix and probably a higher proportion of houses over flats, whilst the eastern side of the site is likely to have fewer flats. This is an evolving mix approach, as recognised at outline stage.

Item 7: DC/21/4003/ARM - Approval of reserved matters - the construction of 22 dwellings together with associated works, landscaping and infrastructure for Brightwell Lakes (Phase W1a) - on DC/20/1234/VOC - Land to the south and east of Adastral Park

Consultation responses

The latest re-consultation ended on 18 July 2022 - this followed receipt of a number of design revisions, as listed within the report. Since the publication of the committee report a number of further consultee responses were received – these are shown below in bold.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Kirton Parish Council	8 September 2021 13 September 2021 20 May 2022 4 July 2022	4 October 2021 No response 11 June 2022 14 July 2022
Summary of comments:		
<p><u>4 October 2021</u> “Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council considered this application at its meeting in 20th September 2021 and objects to the proposals, having severe reservation about generated traffic that will put utmost strain on an already over capacity road network which relies on the main arterial roads (A12/A14) to allow cars and HGV’s to travel to and from work etc. This is a peninsular, so alternative routes are unavailable as Ipswich is very quickly gridlocked. Noise, light and construction dust pollution will have a massive effect on wildlife and existing homeowners in what is a tranquil area. All surface water will inevitably flow into the Mill River and surrounding watercourses leading to potential flooding downstream.”</p> <p><u>11 June 2022</u> “Kirton & Falkenham PC have no comments to make on this application.”</p> <p><u>14 July 2022</u> “Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council has considered this application and has no comments to make.”</p>		

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
East Suffolk Housing Development Team	8 September 2021 13 September 2021 20 May 2022 4 July 2022	No response No response No response 14 July 2022
Summary of comments:		
<p><u>14 July 2022</u> “Advice on this scheme was provided in February but does not appear to have been considered. As it stands, the mix, property types and layout are wholly unacceptable in its current format for the following reasons.</p> <p>5. 60 units or 75% of all the affordable housing is delivered as flats, whilst all the market housing are houses. This is against the tenure neutral guidance presented in the local plan and Affordable housing SPD</p> <p>6. There are no three or four bed homes available as affordable homes. This does not meet the</p>		

needs of the local community as per guidance in the local plan, SHMAA and previous advice from the Housing Enabling Team.

7. None of the affordable homes meet the M4(2) standard. This is against the Affordable housing SPD guidance which is based on evidenced need of this form of housing.
8. The location of all the affordable housing is located near the road and is not well integrated within the rest of the scheme. This is against the policies within the Local Plan and Affordable Housing SPD.

The application is for a net total of 173. For this site, a total of 80 affordable homes. The Councils preferred mix was provided below on 24th February, 2022. It clearly shows a need for three and four bed homes across all affordable housing tenures.

At least 50% of all dwellings should meet the building regulations M4(2) wheelchair accessible standards, both for market and affordable homes. The matrix above reflects the higher need for M4(2) dwellings in the affordable sector, especially the affordable rented sector. The wheelchair adaptable standard M4(3) would be supported and applicants are welcome to discuss how these properties could be delivered as part of the scheme.

All homes must be in small clusters of no more than 10 homes and not contiguous, well-integrated and indistinguishable within the scheme with equal access to amenities such as children's play parks and amenity green space.

Dwellings should meet the following size standards; 1 bed, 2 persons; 2 bed, 4 persons; 3 bed, 5 persons; and 4 bed, 6 persons, with a predominance of houses, especially for families."

See full response on Public Access.

Consultee	Date consulted	Date reply received
Waldringfield Parish Council	8 September 2021	22 October 2021
	13 September 2021	No response
	20 May 2022	16 June 2022
	4 July 2022	18 July 2022

Summary of comments:

22 October 2021

"We would like to thank the officers from ESC and the representatives of the applicants for organising and attending the two virtual meetings held on October 15th. Both meetings were extremely helpful. Most of the issues we wish to raise apply to each/all of the applications listed above and this response is sent in respect of each of the 4 ARMs. Our comments are based primarily on assessing the information included in these applications against conditions in the Outline Planning Permission DC/17/1435/OUT. We have arranged our comments by topic. 1. Access The applications include statements that are ambiguous and in some cases contradictory, here are some examples: "The main access to the Site is from Ipswich Road located on the southeast. A further vehicular access is proposed from the Boulevard Spine Road which links to the main access via the proposed primary road." (DCS Phase E1, §3.13). (Our emphasis). It is not clear from the above paragraph whether the reference to the "Site" relates to the entire Brightwell Lakes site or just the area of phase E1. Also it doesn't specify if the access to Ipswich Rd

is the East Ipswich Rd access or the West Ipswich Rd access. "The main vehicular route into Phase E1 is located on the south-east providing access to Ipswich Road and the wider highway network. A secondary access is to be created from the Spine Road ..." (Phase E1 Planning Statement, §3.3) (Our emphasis). In more recent discussions with the applicants we have been informed that "Once occupied, residents will only be able to access the site via the new A12 junction and the Eastern Ipswich Road access points." (Our emphasis.) Is this the entire Brightwell Lakes site or just the area of phase E1? "Alongside new point of access which in the short term will provide a temporary exit route for construction traffic but over the lifetime of the development be converted into an emergency access point only." (Phase E1 Planning Statement, §5.59) (Our emphasis). Subsequent discussions with the applicants indicated that the above paragraph is referring to West Ipswich Rd access but this is not clear from the statements in the ARMs. Is this to be seen as VOC of Condition 43, or is it an error? We would ask that the ARMs are amended to ensure that there is complete continuity and consistency across all the statements on the matter of the access routes within the ARMs in order to comply with outline planning consent conditions and avoid misunderstandings/confusion. The outline planning permission is clear that the primary access point is to be a new traffic signal controlled 3 way junction on the A12 between the existing Foxhall Road and BT roundabouts. Two secondary access points are proposed onto the Ipswich Rd.

2. Charging Points for Electric Vehicles The move towards electric vehicles (EVs) has accelerated considerably since the outline planning consent in 2018. The UK Government intends to pass legislation (which will come into law in 2022) which will mandate EV charging points on all new buildings: "We will publish our consultation response on requiring all new residential and non-residential buildings to have a charge point, and we intend to lay legislation later this year," (Department for Transport Minister Rachel Maclean. <https://earth.org/uk-to-be-first-country-to-require-new-homes-to-have-built-in-ev-chargers/>) We are not planning lawyers but this would seem to override the now outdated planning condition 64. "Prior to the submission of the 1000th dwelling for layout reserved matters approval, an electric vehicle charging strategy shall be submitted" (Planning Condition 64). Even without the anticipated new legislation this planning condition has been overtaken by the rapid development of technology and sales and is now in conflict with: "ESC Policy SCLP7.2. c) Proposals involving vehicle parking will be supported where they take opportunities to make efficient use of land and they include: c. Appropriate provision for vehicle charging points and ancillary infrastructure associated with the increased use of low emission vehicles;" This is referred to in the both the E1 and W1 Planning Statements, §4.18. However, there is no mention in any of the four ARMs of charging points for electric vehicles, either attached to the houses or in the parking courtyards, or on the street. Given that all new cars sold from 2030 onwards are to be EVs, it is essential that all homes and all parking courtyards have EV charging points. If the charging strategy (let alone the actual charging points) is delayed until plans for 1,000 houses have been submitted, that will be far too late. What would happen to the plots that have already been built? Either they would be left without public charging points, or charging points would have to be retro-fitted, which would be disruptive and expensive. We appreciate there are complications with management companies and a rapidly changing technology, and that charging points are covered by building regulations rather than planning, but feel that a general statement of strategy from both ESC and the applicants would be helpful.

3. Street Lighting There is no mention of street lighting and the need to avoid light pollution. There are some welcome statements in the Environmental Action Plan, Appendix 6: CEMP Ecology Method Statements, Protection from lighting disturbance, but this is solely about the construction phase (CEMP = Construction Environmental Management Plan). Following subsequent discussions with the applicants we understand that the details of the external lighting will now be submitted as an addition to the ARMs to comply with condition 61: "As part of each layout reserved matters application, details of external lighting to be installed ... shall be submitted to and approved" (Planning Condition 61) We would ask that consultees are given the

opportunity to comment on these later submissions.

4. Construction Phases Apart from the ecological constraints described in the CEMP, there doesn't seem to be anything about how the construction phases will work. How will the building materials, lorries, diggers, etc. access the site? What volume of construction traffic is predicted along the Ipswich Rd for the two main phases (E1 and W1)? Is the A12 access to be used for construction traffic? We appreciate that prior to any development taking place a Construction Method/Management Statement will be submitted for approval (Planning Condition 18), however it would be useful to have answers to these questions this stage, as they will have a profound impact on the traffic on the Ipswich Road and therefore on the residents of Waldringfield. We would like assurance that the public footpaths running along the south sides of both sites, E1 and W1 will remain open during construction.

5. Car Parking Since the tertiary roads within the phases are so narrow, it is essential that sufficient off-street and on-street parking laybys are provided, to prevent parking in the roadside, potentially blocking the road. We would ask for the parking provision to be broken down and shown by ARM areas rather than for the whole site. The off-street parking courts in the private parking areas appear to be isolated from the dwellings they are serving, and in many cases these areas are bordered by garden fences/hedges etc and so are not overlooked by the residents of the dwellings. We are concerned that, because of this layout, getting from the parking bay to the front door could be intimidating and possibly dangerous at night, particularly for women. We would wish to see the detailed lighting plan for these areas included in the plans to be submitted under item 3 above.

6. Energy Efficiency There appears to be no mention of the energy efficiency of the houses. Given that the Government is legally obliged to reduce the UK's greenhouse gas emissions by 68% by 2030, and that housing contributes 18% of the UK's emissions, it is essential that all new homes are built to the highest possible standards of energy efficiency. Will the houses have loft insulation? Cavity wall insulation? Double or even triple glazing? Solar PV panels? Heat pumps?

7. Phasing and Timing Although a phasing map is provided, there are no accompanying dates or even approximate timings. Some timings have been provided elsewhere, for example in the slides which were presented to the Brightwell Lakes Community Forum in June 2021, but without this information in the ARMs it is difficult to get a clear picture of how these four phases fit in to the bigger picture. We ask to be provided, as part of the ARMs, a timing sequence of the start and completion dates of:

- Ipswich Rd access West
- Ipswich Rd access East
- A12 junction
- 'Spine' road (boulevard)
- Phases W1, W1a, E1 & E1a
- SANG (various areas)

8. Previously submitted but undetermined ARMs We understand from subsequent discussions with the applicant and ESC that the applicants are currently reviewing/amending the two extant ARMs DC/18/2774/ARM (infrastructure) and DC/18/2775/ARM (SANG), and that these revisions will shortly be submitted to ESC. We ask to be notified and invited to comment on the changes.

9. Phase E1a The Phase E1 Landscape Masterplan (JBA18/163-SK02) clearly shows the E1a area covering 9 houses, whereas all the other plans show E1a covering a much smaller area of just 3 houses. We have learnt in subsequent discussions that E1a will now consist of just 3 show houses.

10. Landscaping & Arboriculture WPC's Tree Warden has submitted comments on the landscaping and arboriculture aspects separately, and WPC fully endorses these."

22 October 2021

"Waldringfield tree warden's comments on the submission for Brightwell Lakes Phases E1, W1, E1a and W1b

1 Overall concept The phases here detailed are residential developments, the first four areas of the several required to complete the site. The layout of these is necessarily quite tight incorporating houses and flats, garages and parking spaces, cycle storage, footpaths and roads. There are few opportunities left for landscape planting of trees, hedges, shrubs and herbaceous material, and grasses. However where these exist they have not been used to their full advantage.

2 Wildlife corridors Although mention has been made of wildlife corridors in past documents these now seem to consist almost entirely of the peripheral bridleways which are

already in existence for the main part and the necessary open spaces or SANGs including the main one around the lake not yet fully designed. There is no attempt to take the wildlife corridor into the housing development where it might link up with gardens. In these layouts gardens do not back onto open areas but very largely onto other gardens meaning they are surrounded by tall (1.8m) grey closeboard fencing. The back gardens are turfed. There are no trees or climbers in the gardens whatsoever native or otherwise (see condition 12).

3 Proposed Trees Proposed trees are spaced 15m apart along both sides of main access roads. Trees within the development are a mere sprinkle. There are no groups of trees of different sizes and species. There are many dwellings within the development where there will not be a single tree visible from a window until residents (hopefully) start to plant them.

4 Tree canopy on maturity On the planting plan all proposed trees of whatever species or initial planting size are shown as circles of diameter 5m. It is not known at what stage of their development they are meant to be illustrated. However many are very narrowly fastigate trees. These are suited to restricted spaces such as city courtyards. There is a lot of the upright growing field maple *Acer campestre* Streetwise. This is predicted to reach a diameter of 3m after 25 years (using data from Hillier Nurseries). *Carpinus betulus* Franz Fontaine will reach 2.5 crown diameter, ornamental cherry *Prunus Amanogawa* only 1m wide after 25 years. Fastigate birch may make 1.5m wide spread and *Pyrus Chanticleer* (ornamental pear) 3m. Therefore all of these will be much narrower columns than shown on plan. Only *Acer Elsrijk* may reach 6m after 25 years and *Liquidambar* is predicted to reach 5m diameter. The others would be much smaller than the circles shown on the plans, half as big or less in some cases. These severely upright trees cast less shade, and are mostly without the contrast of more spreading forms as shown on the optimistic illustrative sections. They will not provide much leafy mass to complement the buildings. The exception Silver Birch is a native tree but shortlived. It has a limited lifespan of 60-80 years. There are very few shown although these are very good for wildlife supporting many insect species.

5 Species of trees selected The cultivar of Field Maple Streetwise is a clone. Therefore although providing food for wildlife in the seeds and leaves they are identical genetically which would mean a disaster if a disease struck. All the cultivars are genetically identical so similarly the cultivars of Hornbeam would be identical with each other. Among the tree species represented there are no oak, which is the main forest tree in this area in the woods bordering the larger overall site to the north and west. There is no hazel, no willow, no holly and in fact there are no native shrubs whatsoever. It seems that the wildlife travelling through will not find much sustenance. There are no pines to tie in visually with the existing tree belt of Austrian Pine, with one exception.

6 Survival of trees This area has had severe droughts in the past few summers and these very tall rootballed specimen trees are going to need plenty of watering. Generally, smaller trees survive better. No watering system is specified. Either an underground fitted irrigation system or a water bag to deliver water over a period may be necessary to combat drought and see the survival of these trees. Examples exist nearby of tall specimen trees planted and subsequently dying in numbers (e.g. Silver Birch at BT Adastral Park) *Liquidambar* is a fine tree from North America. It prefers a well drained but moist soil.

7 Shrubs: maintenance All ornamental, these are planted in 1m wide bands around the housing. They are maintained by the contractor in the first year. After this there is no management plan that we know of so far. Do the residents clip them? There are topiary yews and bay in pairs at several of the entrances. Are these maintained by the resident or visiting contractors? This seems rather a quirky idea. If contractor, they may end up like the planting at nearby Martlesham Heath Retail Park which is all cut by hedge trimmer to the same height, often removing flowers and berries. Most of these shrubs will outgrow their position if not carefully maintained.

8 Use of poisonous shrubs There are quite a lot of varieties of spindle (*Euonymus*) in the planting which is close to footpaths and house frontages. The native spindle is highly poisonous in all parts. These foreign relatives of it are also marked as injurious, may cause skin irritation. It is used very widely throughout the site in many cases close to where pedestrians will walk and ultimately the

residents may decide to cut these themselves and would have to handle the foliage. 9 Non-native shrubs The Taylor Wimpey Environmental Strategy states that 'all new sites (will) have planting that provides for local species throughout the seasons'. None of the many thousands of shrubs or hedges is a native species. While many have flowers and berries which may support our wildlife – Choisya and Hebe for example are good for bees when in flower – generally they are planted for their decorative foliage and do not provide 'food and shelter' for wildlife throughout the site. While not expecting a design with entirely British wild plants it is as though these have been excluded entirely. 10 Basin (in E1) This damp area receiving drainage from the swales is to be sown with a wetland wildflower and grass mix. It could be enhanced by adding a few groups of shrubby willows, dogwood and/or alder. This would increase its wildlife potential greatly. 11 Swales These are part of the Suds system and could provide useful habitat if they are maintained with the longer grass and flowers cut on a less frequent programme as described. The swales, about 8m long, are meant to be surrounded by shorter grass it would appear. I have not found a section drawing showing the depth and slopes of the swales. 12 Private gardens These are to be turfed and surrounded by fencing with no further planting. 13 Suggestions for greening the site A number of fairly easy things could be done to improve the appearance and wildlife potential of the new residential areas: 13.1 Residents with gardens could be offered a choice of small trees to plant in their gardens, such as Rowan, Crab Apple, Cherry Plum or varieties of domestic apple which would attract birds and bees into their gardens at the very least and soften the overall effect of the stark closeboard fencing. 13.2 Residents could also be offered a climber to go on their fence with a trellis attached for them (less work than clipping topiary) such as a climbing rose, clematis or honeysuckle, or an ornamental ivy, which they could select from. These would all provide nesting sites and soften the appearance of so many fences. 13.3 Street trees which are 15m apart could be at least doubled in number and do not have to be entirely fastigate. The narrow forms suit tight spaces, they are not necessary where the trees have plenty of space all around them. Whitebeam, Rowan, Crab apple, Wild Pear and larger growing trees such as Wild Cherry, Small Leafed Lime, Oak and Scots Pine could be placed where space permits. 13.4 Native hedges could be incorporated in some areas including fruiting plants for wildlife such as hawthorn, elderberry, dogrose, cherry plum, dogwood, holly, which all grow in the area. 14 In conclusion The plans are disappointing on a number of fronts. Wildlife and nature seem to have been far from the minds of whoever drew up the plans. The canopy effect will be very sparse even if all the trees grow to maturity. There is no relationship between the coastal location in Suffolk, with low rainfall and extremely sharp drainage, and the proposed vegetation on site. These proposals could just as easily be in any county in England. There are very few native species included."

16 June 2022

"Waldringfield Parish Council met to discuss these applications and decided that it wished to make no additional comments to those previously submitted."

18 July 2022

"WPC wishes to express our concern regarding the Variation of Condition application, DC/20/1234/VOC, referenced in these Reserved Matters applications. These applications are intrinsically linked with each other. This VOC has yet to be determined but the Parish Council has not been notified of the significant number of new documents submitted under DC/20/1234/VOC in the period 2018 to present. We will be writing separately on this matter.

With regards to the most recent documents submitted on DC/21/4002/ARM & DC/21/4003/ARM WPC is pleased to see the following amendments:

- Water level of the drainage “lake” in the SANG valley is to be reduced to a low enough level to remove the protective fencing and make it more of an attractive amenity.
- Parking provision improved to meet SCC standards
- Stretch of footpath increased to 3mts wide to allow pedestrian and cycle access to other areas of the site.
- Additional native species shrubs added. We are concerned that there appears to be some inconsistencies between the following drawings submitted.
- The Cycle Hierarchy Plan, 10596 – 2001 – 120
- The connectivity plan, drawing 22274/C11/CP
- The PROW Plan drawing 22274-PROW-01
- Drawing 10391-HL-110 as contained in condition 10 of the outline planning consent

For example the connectivity plan, drawing 22274/C11/CP shows some bridleways and describes them as pedestrian & cycle routes.

This drawing omits the “proposed permissive route” shown as Y - Z on the drawing 10391-HL-110. We would have imagined that this was an important link to the pedestrian & cycle routes and therefore should be included in 22274/C11/CP.”

Design and conservation comments

Key comments for the applicant to specifically address within this parcel, which were initially raised by the Design and Conservation Officer are summarised below with a summary of latest revisions noted in blue.

- **Massing/landmarking:** Massing to the A12 frontage works well enough in respect of the use of three-storey townhouses. However, the massing approach is undermined by the use of a two-storey dwelling (Plot 6) immediately next to the townhouse (Plot 7) that turns the corner onto the spine-road frontage. This massing device appears to weaken this key corner and its effect is questionable.

The design outcome of this key corner where two key frontages join to create the development entrance is disappointing. Plot 7 on the corner is a three-storey townhouse, which is welcomed, but this is not a corner-turning house type design. The flank elevation that will be read on entering the development reads as largely blank with random small fenestration. This elevation entirely ignores the spine road and the house’s key position on it. This will be the first dwelling to be seen on approach into the development and when passing by it on the A12 and yet has received no special treatment. This disappointment is compounded by the treatment of the spine road frontage immediately adjacent: the presentation of a great length of high close boarded fencing (ugly and inappropriate in length, position and material) and the rather feeble positioning of a small flat-over-a-garage building. This building type is hardly appealing visually and presents a dead frontage to the spine road – next to the entrance, of all places for it. The large gap, the boundary barrier and the FOG, all combine with the poor-quality flank to Plot 7, to weaken the design of the entrance area to the development to its detriment. This part of the design needs to be reconsidered.

Plots 6 and 7 have been re-elevated, partly to address The Boulevard and partly to increase the height of Plot 6 in order to create more impact as the gateway into the site. Additionally, moving further along The Boulevard, Plots 104-109 have increased in height to a full three storey to act as the vista stopper to the proposed spur road opposite.

- **Dwelling design:** No support for the flat-over garage house type in terms of design quality and residential amenity.

This is a standard house type for Taylor Wimpey and has not been addressed in any of the design revisions.

- **Boundary treatments:** The boundary treatment strategy requires revision - there should be no close-boarded timber fencing used on either of the key frontages to the A12 and spine road boulevard. High brick walls only will be acceptable here, to ensure quality and continuity of frontage.

All boundary treatments have been reviewed - any rear garden boundaries facing onto the public highway are now facing brick walls (see Boundary Treatment Plan).

- **Materials:** There is no detailed materials schedule supplied that allows scrutinisation of materials specification – further details required.

No further details submitted – these will be required to be submitted and agreed by the Design and Conservation Officer prior to issuing a decision.

The above changes to the proposal have been reviewed by the Planning Manager and he has discussed these with the Principal Design and Conservation Officer. Unfortunately, due to some short term but demanding resource matters within the Design and Conservation Team, a full concluding write up of the revisions has not been possible. However, the Principal Design and Conservation Officer has reviewed the amended submission and is satisfied with the changes made in response to his original points of criticism within a wider supportive response. Therefore, the application as amended has his support.

Affordable housing

The Planning Manager has reviewed the application alongside comments received by the Housing Strategy and Enabling Manager and is satisfied with the position the local planning authority has reached. Although it does not have a comprehensive mix, as an early and higher density parcel of the site, which plays an important role in the delivery of the Boulevard, the flat led approach to affordable delivery from this parcel was anticipated and is what the Planning Manager believes will work best for the place shaping role for the taller and higher density-built frontage of the Boulevard needs. The Planning Manager is pleased that the open market and affordable does interchange along the boulevard and also that there is no affordable pushed onto the A12 frontage, which the past developer interest had aimed at.

Subsequently, Taylor Wimpey has confirmed that they will work closely with the Housing Strategy and Enabling Manager to develop a clear strategy on how the mix is distributed across further parcels. The Planning Manager is certain that the large parcels immediately north will have a better mix and probably a higher proportion of houses over flats, whilst the eastern side of the site is likely to have fewer flats. This is an evolving mix approach, as recognised at outline stage.

Item 11 - DC/22/1996/FUL: Replacement beach side kiosk adjacent to promenade. Kiosk Site near Bent Hill, The Promenade, Undercliff Road West, Felixstowe, IP11 2AB

Additional information received – Coastal Erosion Vulnerability Assessment (Level B) received 20 July 2022.

DC/22/1303/FUL: Construction of single storey side and rear extensions and alterations to dwelling 5 Gladstone Road, Woodbridge, IP12 1EF

There was a total of 4 neighbour objections as opposed to 2 as referenced in the report. The omitted objections raised similar concerns.

Item 8 - DC/21/5698/FUL - Single storey outbuilding to be used for food preparation by occupiers/ owners in connection with catering company at 60 Old Barrack Road, Woodbridge, IP12 4ER

Revised block plan drawing no. '8093 – PA/21/04 Rev. B' received showing proposed pathway between outbuilding and existing dwelling, and bin presentation/ storage areas.